

Appl. No. 10/006,432
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 28, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

In item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges confirmation of receipt of Applicant's certified copy of the priority document for the German Patent Application 200 20 983.3, filed December 7, 2000 supporting the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

Claims 1-23 are in the application. Claims 1, 5, and 23 have been amended.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,007,516 to Coules (hereinafter '516) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In item 4 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-4, 12, and 23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,751,545 to Jung (hereinafter '545) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejections have been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the

Appl. No. 10/006,432
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 28, 2003

changes is found on pages 5 and 6 of the specification of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful. Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, a device for locking a first housing part and a second housing part to one another in a multi-part housing, the device including:

a locking element disposed in a slot shaped opening in the first housing part, the locking element being configured to be movable in a longitudinal direction between a locking position and an unlocking position; and

a blocking element disposed in the locking element.

Claim 23 calls for, *inter alia*, a multi-part housing configuration including:

a locking element configured to be movable in the longitudinal direction between a locking position and an unlocking position and being displaceable in the longitudinal direction between the locking position and the unlocking position; and

Appl. No. 10/006,432
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 28, 2003

a blocking element **disposed in** said locking element.

The '516 reference discloses a quarter turn locking fastener device. More specifically, as stated in the penultimate paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, '516 discloses the "rotational displacement of part 31" and not "movable in the longitudinal direction" as recited in amended claim 1 or "being displaceable in the longitudinal direction" as recited in amended claim 23.

Clearly, '516 does not show a locking element being "movable in the longitudinal direction between a locking position and an unlocking position" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The '545 reference discloses a desktop personal computer where the cover can easily be assembled onto or removed from the base without the use of screws or tools. More specifically, '545 discloses "knuckles at both its first end 131 and its second end 132" but not a "blocking element disposed in said locking element" as recited in claim 1 and claim 23.

Appl. No. 10/006,432
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 28, 2003

Clearly, '545 does not show a blocking element "disposed in" the locking element as recited in claims 1 and 23 of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims 2-4 and 12 are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

Finally, applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's statement that claims 5-11 and 13-22 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant has rewritten claim 5 in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is therefore believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims 6-11 and 13-22 are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-23 are solicited.

09-29-'03 18:46 FROM-Lerner & Greenberg

+9549251101

T-352 P18/20 U-001

Appl. No. 10/006,432


Amdt. Dated September 29, 2003

Reply to Office Action of May 28, 2003

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$110.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith. Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Kyle H. Flindt
Reg. No. 42,539

KHF:cgm

September 29, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101